



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/652,345	08/29/2003	Jhaozhong Jiang	MDM-0305	1295
27810	7590	03/31/2005	EXAMINER	
EXXONMOBIL RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING COMPANY			NGUYEN, TAM M	
P.O. BOX 900			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1545 ROUTE 22 EAST			1764	
ANNANDALE, NJ 08801-0900			DATE MAILED: 03/31/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/652,345

Applicant(s)

JIANG, JHAOZHONG

Examiner

Tam M. Nguyen

Art Unit

1764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2003.
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/26/04.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 9-13 of copending Application No. 10/652,345. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims claim a dewaxing process by using a regenerated catalyst. The copending claimed set does not specifically claim that the feedstock is decreased in pour point or cloud point or both and preserved the viscosity of a paraffin containing feedstock. However, the process of the copending claimed set is the same as the process of the present claimed set. Therefore, it would be expected that, after dewaxing, the feedstock of the copending claimed set would have the same characteristics as the present claimed feedstock.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xiao et al. (6,264,826) in view of Carroll et al. (6,569,312) and Chester et al. (4,810,357).

Xiao discloses a dewaxing process by contacting a hydrocarbon feedstock with a molecular sieve catalyst comprising platinum having a pore size of 5.3 to about 6.5 angstroms (.53 -.65 nm). The dewaxing process is operated without adding hydrogen to the process. The dewaxed hydrocarbon is then hydrotreated (hydrofinishing) to produce lubricant oil. It is noted the Xiao does not disclose the hydrogen partial pressure of less than 100 or 70 psig. However, the process of Xiao does not involve a step of adding hydrogen to the dewaxing process. Therefore, it would be expected that the Xiao process would have a hydrogen partial process of

Art Unit: 1764

less than 70 psig as claimed. Consequence, the catalyst would have the TRI as claimed. (See abstract; col. 9, lines 4-6, 46-61, col. 12, lines 7-10)

Xiao does not specifically disclose that the catalyst has a one-dimensional pore structure, does not disclose that the molecular sieve is ZSM-48, and does not disclose a step of regenerating the dewaxing catalyst.

Carroll discloses a dewaxing process wherein a ZSM-48 catalyst having one dimensional structure is used. (See col. 5, lines 16-25; col. 14, lines 36-58)

Chester discloses a process for regenerating a dewaxing catalyst. (See col. 4, lines 27-39).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Xiao by using the catalyst of Carroll because ZSM-48 has equivalent function as ZSM-23 in a dewaxing process.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Xiao/Carroll by using two dewaxing zones, one of which is used for dewaxing while the other is regenerated and then vice versa, as taught by Chester because one would have been motivated to make such a modification so that the process can run continuously, even while regenerating the catalyst. Consequently, since the modified process of Xiao is essentially the same as the claimed process, it would be expected that the Xiao feedstock would have decreased in pour point, or cloud point and preserved the viscosity of a paraffin containing stock as claimed.

Conclusion


Art Unit: 1764

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tam M. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 1764


3/29/05

TN